

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings reverses previous changes to Figure 4. The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes Figure 4 replaces the previously submitted replacement sheet that replaced the original sheet including Figure 4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Please delete the previously submitted "New Sheet" of drawings including Figure 2a.

REMARKS

Claims 31-37 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview of June 27, 2006, wherein Examiner Jimmy H. Nguyen and Applicant's representative of record, Jennifer S. Brooks, discussed Applicants' proposed claims 31-37. The Examiner suggested changes to Applicants' proposed claims in order to avoid rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, and to avoid New Matter rejections. Agreement was reached that the claims presented herein are fully enabled in the originally filed Specification and are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The Examiner and Applicants' also discussed enablement of Applicants' claimed circle removal technique, especially regarding Figure 4 and proposed claim 37. In particular, the ability of the technique to remove the circle without removing text contained within the circle was discussed. Agreement was reached that the technique described in claim 37 successfully removes a hand drawn circle from the circled region without removing handwritten text contained within the hand drawn circle, and that Figure 4 is permissible as originally filed.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicants have added claims 31-37. Support for the additions can be found in the originally filed specification, especially at Figure 2 and related discussion, which explains that the whiteboard notes 24 with hand drawn circled region 26 are scanned from whiteboard, that the circled region is detected and extracted with the hand drawn

circle removed at element 28 so that handwriting recognition can be performed in order to generate recognized text 30 to be used as a header for the notes. This process is further described with reference to Figure 3, which clearly illustrates circled region extraction at 30, circle removal at 34, handwriting recognition at 50, and header creation and association with the notes at 52, 54, 56, and 58. Removal of detected circle pixels is also described with reference to Figure 4. Header display, selection, and plotting of machine drawn marks to recreate the notes to whiteboard are also described with reference to Figures 5b and 6. Therefore, no new matter is added, and all of the claimed subject matter is illustrated in the Figures and described in the text of the originally filed specification.

The new claims are distinguishable over the currently cited references, Carau, Sr. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,318,825) in view of Weber et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,572,651). For example, Carau does not teach detection of a circle in notes scanned from whiteboard, extraction of a copy of a region of the notes containing the circle, removal of the circle, or performing handwriting recognition on the copy to generate a text header for the notes. Also, Weber et al. only teach circling text on an "electronic 'whiteboard'" using some sort of stroke input device, such as a marker pen with a touch sensitive tip (Fig. 1, element 20, Fig. 4, element 88, col. 10, line 66-col. 11, line 34, and especially col. 11, lines 21-27). Thus, the circle is immediately interpreted as an object designating a key element (Figs. 10-13, col. 19, line 24-col. 20, line 60, and especially Table 1 at col. 20, lines 42-60) so that the circle never becomes part of the notes. Rather, the circle stroke object and the notes can be co-displayed, but the circle is not contained in the notes in such a way that detection of the circle in the notes is ever needed. It should also be

noted that the only “header” that is created is the key object that contains the circle, while the notes having the header (displayed in Figure 9 without the circles) never contained the circles. Therefore, Weber does not teach that notes containing a circle are scanned from whiteboard, detecting a circle in the scanned notes and making a copy of a region of the notes containing the circle, and removing the circle from the copy in order to perform handwriting recognition on the copy to generate a text header for the notes. Moreover, the result in Figure 9 of Weber et al., even if misinterpreted to show circle removal, illustrates the opposite of Applicants’ claimed invention. For example, the claims are directed to removing the circle from the header, whereas Weber et al.’s “header,” the key object, is displayed as exhibiting the circle, while it is Weber’s notes that apparently lack the circle. Moreover, Weber et al. specifically teaches away from performing any kind of recognition (Abstract), and can therefore not be used to reject Applicants’ claims, which are directed to creating a notes header using handwriting recognition.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner favorably consider the new claims, at least with respect to the teachings of the currently cited references, Weber et al. and Carau.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have deleted the previously submitted new drawing including Figure 2a. Applicants have also resubmitted Figure 4 in its original form in order to show the circle that is detected and therefore removed by erasure of the detected pixels of the circle. The text within the circle is not illustrated in Figure 4 because the pixels of the text are not detected or removed. To

add the handwritten text within the circle of Figure 4 might confuse one skilled in the art by implying at first glance that the pixels of the handwritten text are also removed. Therefore, Figure 4 is correct in its original form. The results of circle removal in order to obtain a text region upon which handwriting recognition can be successfully performed to create a recognized text header is clearly illustrated in originally filed Figure 2 at elements 26 and 28. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

ABSTRACT

Applicants have amended the abstract to accord with the new claims. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, 11, 13-14, 16-19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have cancelled claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, 11, 13-14, 16-19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, and 30 herein. Therefore, the rejections are rendered moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, 11, 16-19, 26, 28, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Carau, Sr. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,318,825) in view of Weber et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,572,651). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have cancelled herein claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, 11, 16-19, 26, 28, and 30. Therefore, this rejection is moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 28, 2006

By: Greg Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/JSB/kup